REMARKS

Claims 1 through 18 are pending in this application. The Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication of allowability concerning claims 15 through 18.

I. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

According to MPEP 706.02(j), the following establishes a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103:

> To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

A. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Megied et al. (USPN 6556253 B1) in view of Jameson (USPN 6396487 B1), hereinafter simply Megied and Jameson. The Applicant respectfully traverses.

1. In regard to claims 1 and 8, the combination of Megied and Jameson fail to teach or suggest a setting part displaying a set portion at a user chosen arbitrary position of a screen.

Col. 1, lines 15-22 of Magied, which the Examiner quotes, teaches only that the graphics and text are displayed at different predefined regions. A predefined region is clearly not a user arbitrary position of a screen.

Jameson on col. 3, lines 19-55 only discusses the method of resizing a window using a mouse, but clearly does not address a setting portion displaying a set portion at a user chosen arbitrary position of the screen. In the present invention the setting part is different than the size adjuster part which separately adjusts the size from the setting part. The distinct structure of the setting portion and the adjuster part is not taught or suggested by Jameson or Magied or the combination of the Jameson and Magied.

The disclosure of Jameson does not apply to the setting portion as Jameson concerns the resizing part only.

2. In regard to claims 2, 9, the Examiner stated that Megied teaches a displaying apparatus comprising a signal generator part generating (video driver) a video signal, and a display part

displaying (monitor) thereon a picture based on the video signal generated by the signal generator part, see Fig. 2, wherein the controller part increases a signal level of the set portion by synthesizing a value of the video signal and a value of the setting signal. See col. 6 lines 10-15.

However, Megied in col. 6, lines 10-15 indicates decreasing the light output of the windows and not increasing the signal level of the set portion by specifically synthesizing a value of the video signal and a value of the setting signal as in the present invention.

3. In regard to claims 3, 10, the Examiner stated that Megied teaches a displaying apparatus comprising a signal generator part generating (video driver) a video signal, and a display part displaying (monitor) thereon a picture based on the video signal generated by the signal generator part, see Fig. 2, wherein the controller part decreases a signal level of the set portion by offsetting a value of the video signal and a value of the setting signal. See col. 5 lines 62-65.

However, col. 5, lines 62-65 of Megied , states "Similarly, if any of summands B1.sub.USER, B2.sub.USER, B3.sub.USER and B4.sub.USER set by the user has a lower value than value B.sub.LOOP-MIN, then loop controller 117 would not reduce the brightness in the window that corresponds to such summand. This is so because the light output in such window is already low." Here the loop controller would not reduce the brightness in the window, which neither says it is increasing or decreasing the signal level of the set portion.

Moreover, Megied is also not stating that the decrease of the signal level is by offsetting the value of the video signal and the value of the setting signal. The specific teaching of offsetting the values of both the video signal and setting signal is not taught or suggested as Megied only states of

not reducing the brightness of the window.

4. In regard to claims 4, 11, the Examiner stated that Megied teaches a displaying apparatus comprising a signal generator part generating (video driver) a video signal, and a display part displaying (monitor) thereon a picture based on the video signal generated by the signal generator part, see Fig. 2, further comprising a clock generator part generating a clock according to a reference position of the set portion based on the position value of the set portion set by the portion set part (multiplexer applies luminance signal correspond to time which read on generating a clock). See col. 3 lines 49-57.

However, col. 3, lines 49-57 indicates only a multiplexer selectively applying luminance signals in corresponding time slots. This does not teach or suggest a clock according to a reference position of the set portion based on the position value of the set portion set by the set part. No such relationship is given.

5. In regard to claims 5, 12, the arguments for claims 4, 8 and 1 apply as the claim 5 depends on claims 1 and 4 and claim 12 depends on claim 8.

6. In regard to claims 6, 13, the Examiner stated that Megied teaches a displaying apparatus comprising a signal generator part generating (video driver) a video signal, and a display part displaying (monitor) thereon a picture based on the video signal generated by the signal generator part, see Fig. 2, further comprising a storage part (memory 116) storing the position value of the set

portion set through the setting part; and a scaler (user adjustable window which read on magnifying the signal level) adjusting the width of the setting signal of the set portion set through the size adjuster part. See Fig. 2, col. 1 lines 19-22.

However, col. 1, lines 19-22 of Megeid only indicates "Examples of windows are picture-in-picture (PIP), picture-outside-picture (POP) and picture-and-picture (PAP). The size of each window may be user adjustable on a window-by-window basis" Simply being able to adjust the size of windows does not teach or suggest a separate set portion and size adjuster part. Moreover, nowhere is it specifically indicated that the scaler part specifically adjusts the width. Simply resizing does not indicate that such structures or features are included.

7. In regard to claims 7, 14, the Examiner stated that Megied teaches a displaying apparatus comprising a signal generator part generating (video driver) a video signal, and a display part displaying (monitor) thereon a picture based on the video signal generated by the signal generator part, see Fig. 2, wherein the controller adjusts the signal level (changing the brightness levels which read on magnifying the signal level) of the set portion by composing the video signal with the setting signal. See col. 3 lines 44-47.

However, col. 3, lines 44-47 of Megied only indicates that the brightness level of one window can be changed without affecting other windows. The present invention claims adjusting the signal level of the set portion by composing the video signal with the setting signal. To form in combination of the video signal and the setting signal is not specifically taught or suggested. Megied only teaches concerning the level of the window itself in comparison to other windows rather than

in relation to the video signal.

In view of the foregoing remarks, all claims are deemed to be allowable and this application is believed to be in condition to be passed to issue. If there are any questions, the examiner is asked to contact the applicant's attorney.

No fee is incurred by this Response. Should there be a deficiency in payment, or should other fees be incurred, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 02-4943 of Applicant's undersigned attorney in the amount of such fees.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert E. Bushnell,
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No. 27,774

1522 "K" Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 408-9040

Folio: P56531
Date: 9/2/05
I.D.: REB/SS